

### **REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on October 9, 2003. Claims 1-20 are cancelled, and claims 21-41 are added; as a result, claims 21-41 are now pending in this application. Applicant reserves the right to reintroduce claims 1-20 in one or more continuation applications.

#### **Drawings**

The drawings appear to be objected to by the Examiner. The Examiner states on page 2 of the Office Action that "the electronic component secured to the lower surface of the die must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s)."

Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to the attached amended paragraph at page 4, line 5 of the specification, which now describes that the reference numeral 36 refers to electronic components.

Formal drawings are submitted herewith.

#### **First Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1, 3-4 and 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Terui (USPN 6,060,774). Applicant traverses the rejection but has cancelled claims 1, 3-4 and 7-10 such that the rejection is now moot.

#### **Second Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yano (USPN 5,909,058). Applicant traverses the rejection but has cancelled claims 1 and 5 such that the rejection is now moot.

#### **Third Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 7 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kinsman (USPN 6,002,165). Applicant traverses the rejection but has cancelled claims 7 and 12 such that the rejection is now moot.

*First Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103*

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano (USPN 5,909,058) in view of Sakuma (JP 63-287026). Applicant traverses the rejection but has cancelled claim 6 such that the rejection is now moot.

*Second Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103*

Claims 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinsman (USPN 6,002,165). Applicant traverses the rejection but has cancelled claims 17-20 such that the rejection is now moot.

*Interview Summary*

Applicant's attorney would like to thank Examiner Tran for his courtesy during the telephone interview held on November 3, 2003. Although not specifically stated in the Office action, Examiner Tran indicated claims 2, 11 and 13-16 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Examiner Tran also agreed that incorporating limitations similar to those in claims 2, 11 and 13-16 into a claim which is similar to claim 18 would also be allowable.

*New claims 21-23*

As discussed above, claim 2 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has added new claim 21 which includes all the limitations of claim 2 and base independent claim 1 such that claim 21 is allowable.

Claims 22-23 depend from new claim 21 such that claims 22-23 include all the limitations of claim 21. Therefore, claims 22-23 are also allowable.

Allowance of claims 21-23 is respectfully requested.

New claims 24-26

As discussed above, claim 11 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has added new claim 24 which includes all the limitations of claim 11 and base independent claim 7 such that claim 24 is allowable.

Claims 25-26 depend from new claim 24 such that claims 25-26 include all the limitations of claim 24. Therefore, claims 25-26 are also allowable.

Allowance of claims 24-26 is respectfully requested.

New claims 27-29

As discussed above, claim 13 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has added new claim 27 which includes all the limitations of claim 13, intervening claim 12 and base independent claim 7 such that claim 27 is allowable.

Claims 28-29 depend from new claim 27 such that claims 28-29 include all the limitations of claim 27. Therefore, claims 28-29 are also allowable.

Allowance of claims 27-29 is respectfully requested.

New claims 30-32

As discussed above, claim 16 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has added new claim 30 which includes all the limitations of claim 16 and base independent claim 7 such that claim 30 is allowable.

Claims 31-32 depend from new claim 30 such that claims 31-32 include all the limitations of claim 30. Therefore, claims 31-32 are also allowable.

Allowance of claims 30-32 is respectfully requested.

New claims 33-35

As discussed during the interview, Applicant has added new claim 33, which incorporates the limitations of objected to claim 11 into a claim that is similar to claim 18. The Examiner indicated during the interview that such a claim would be allowable.

Claims 34-35 depend from new claim 33 such that claims 34-35 include all the limitations of claim 33. Therefore, claims 34-35 are also allowable.

Allowance of claims 33-35 is respectfully requested.

New claims 36-38

As discussed during the interview, Applicant has added new claim 36, which incorporates the limitations of objected to claim 13 and intervening claim 12 into a claim that is similar to claim 18. The Examiner indicated during the interview that such a claim would be allowable.

Claims 37-38 depend from new claim 36 such that claims 37-38 include all the limitations of claim 36. Therefore, claims 37-38 are also allowable.

Allowance of claims 36-38 is respectfully requested.

New claims 39-41

As discussed during the interview, Applicant has added new claim 39, which incorporates the limitations of objected to claim 16 into a claim that is similar to claim 18. The Examiner indicated during the interview that such a claim would be allowable.

Claims 40-41 depend from new claim 39 such that claims 40-41 include all the limitations of claim 39. Therefore, claims 40-41 are also allowable.

Allowance of claims 39-41 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney Andrew Peret at (262) 646-7009, or the below signed attorney at (612) 349-9592, to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

GLENN E. STEWART

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

Attorneys for Intel Corporation

P.O. Box 2938

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

(612) 373-6970

Date

December 9, 2003

By

Charles E. Steffey

Charles E. Steffey

Reg. No. 25,179

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 9 day of December, 2003.

Name

KACIA LEE

Signature

Kacia Lee